

REMARKS

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C. F. R. §1.84(p)(5). The Examiner noted that reference number 28 is not shown in the figures. A replacement sheet containing Fig. 1 with reference number 28 is submitted herewith. No new matter is sought to be entered by this replacement sheet. Applicants believe the objection to the drawings under 37 C. F. R. §1.84(p)(5) is thus overcome

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected claims 1-18 because of informalities. The Examiner noted that the claim language is not consistent with the specification. The claims have been amended and the objection is thus moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U. S. C § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 12-18 under 35 U. S. C. § 102.. The Examiner relied upon LeCompte U. S. Patent 5,704,825 (hereinafter LeCompte) to support this rejection.

Claims 2-4 and 6-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 19-24 are submitted herewith. No new matter is sought to be entered hereby. Because the number of claims previously paid for exceeds the number of claims currently in the application, no additional fee is required.

LeCompte discloses a blast nozzle that “comprises an inlet portion, an outlet portion and a square venturi orifice connecting the inlet and outlet portions.” LeCompte’s abstract. The inlet portion of the LeCompte blast nozzle includes

“a square inlet for receiving the air and abrasive particle mixture with a pair of opposing flat top and bottom walls and a pair of opposing flat lateral walls. The opposing flat top and bottom walls and opposing flat lateral walls form a four sided pyramidal shape which converges to the square venturi. The outlet portion is similarly shaped and includes a pair of opposing flat top and bottom walls and a pair of opposing flat lateral walls. The opposing flat top and bottom walls and the opposing flat lateral walls form a four sided pyramidal shape also which diverges from the square venturi to a square outlet for directing the air and abrasive particle mixture.”

LeCompte's abstract. LeCompte's blast nozzle is connect directly to an abrasive blast supply hose 12 by means of threaded coupling 14 (LeCompte, Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 62-63) or via a flow straightener 52 to the hose 12 (LeCompte, Fig. 7, col. 4, lines 32-38).

Claim 1 has been amended. LeCompte does not teach claim 1's specifically recited:

“conduit through which [] pulverulent material is transported from a source, the conduit including a first reducer section, a first expander section coupled to the first reducer section, the first expander section downstream in the flow of pulverulent material from the first reducer section, a second reducer section coupled to the first expander section, the second reducer section downstream in the flow of pulverulent material from the first expander section, and a second expander section coupled to the second reducer section, the second expander section downstream in the flow of pulverulent material from the second reducer section, the second expander section adjacent the opening having a cross section transverse to the direction of flow of the pulverulent coating material through the second expander section which is generally rectangular.”

As a result, claim 1, from which claims 5 and 19-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, distinguishes patentably over LeCompte. For at least these reasons, claims 5 and 19-24 also distinguish over LeCompte.

35 U. S. C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon the combination of Hollstein U. S. Patent 6,105,886 (hereinafter Hollstein) and LeCompte to support this rejection.

Claims 8-11 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the 35 U. S. C. § 103 rejection of claims 8-11 has been rendered moot. Additionally, the deficiencies of LeCompte with respect to the rejection of claim 1 are explored in detail above, and that discussion is incorporated here by reference. Hollstein does nothing to overcome these deficiencies. That which is neither disclosed nor suggested by either LeCompte or Hollstein cannot fairly be said to be suggested by any combination of them.

Applicants submit that since independent claim 1 distinguishes patentably from any combination of LeCompte and Hollstein, dependent claims 5 and 19-24, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, patentably distinguish from any combination of LeCompte and Hollstein as well. As a result, claims 5 and 19-24 are now believed to be

allowable. Favorable consideration, culminating in allowance of claims 1, 5 and 19-24, is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be due to constitute this a timely response to the March 22, 2006 official action to Applicants' undersigned counsel's deposit account 10-0435 with reference to file number 3030-72221. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard D. Conard", written in a cursive style.

Richard D. Conard
Registration No. 27321
Attorney for Applicants

Indianapolis, Indiana
(317) 231-7285

INDS02 RDC 814665